



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3305907

10 Jocelyn Road, Richmond Upon Thames, Richmond TW9 2TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Melvin against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/1515/HOT, dated 4 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including a dormer window at third floor/roof level to the rear/south elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the Kew Foot Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Jocelyn Road, within the Kew Foot Road Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Study¹ suggests the significance of the Kew Foot Road Conservation Area is linked to the historical crossing of the Thames in Kew, firstly by foot, followed by the opening of the bridge in 1759, which combined with the creation of Kew Road. The Study acknowledges Kew Foot Road has always been an historic link between Richmond and Kew. Reference to Jocelyn Road is made within the Study where it explains there are four streets, between Kew Road and Kew Foot Road, of Victorian houses notable for their variety of size and style, all linked by a high quality of townscape.
4. Whilst there is a variance in the design and style of properties along Jocelyn Road, the retained historic appearance of most of the properties is representative of the time in which they were built and contributes to the high quality of townscape and therefore the significance of the Conservation Area. The appeal property is also designated as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM).
5. Although there are a variety of roof projections in the area, the appeal property forms part of a terrace block with a largely uniform roofscape. The roofscape to the rear of the terrace properties is defined by two chimney stacks, as well as two single dormer extensions on the roof of 6 Jocelyn Road (No. 6). Some

¹ Conservation Area Study Kew Foot Road no.36 & Sheendale Road no. 50, London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames

neighbouring properties have roof lights, but they are set within the profile of the roof.

6. The two single dormer extensions to No. 6 are materially different to the appeal scheme as they are not joined by a central recess. The principle of rear dormer extensions and the precedent set by other dormer extension is not disputed. However, the inclusion of the recess between both dormer windows would add to the massing of the proposed extension. Whilst the proposed dormer extension does not increase the ridge height of the property and there is a modest amount of space below and to both sides of the proposed dormer extension, due to the inclusion of a central recess it would still cover a large expanse of the roof.
7. Due to its massing, the proposed extension would appear as the most visually dominant feature on the roof, and as such it would significantly alter the appearance of the roofscape. The proposed development would therefore have a harmful effect on a BTM as it would appear as an incongruous feature within the roofscape and would appear unsympathetic to the historic setting of the appeal property, when view from neighbouring gardens and Evelyn Road.
8. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the BTM SPD which indicates the sympathetic adaptation of the buildings can preserve and increase the attractiveness of an area. The proposed development is also contrary to guidance within the House Extensions SPD², which states roof extensions should not dominate the original roof.
9. Imposing a condition which relates to the proposed materials would somewhat reduce the impact of the proposed extension as it would help blend the central recess into the roofscape. However, the proposed extension would still appear as an alien feature due to its massing.
10. Given the modest scale of the proposed development I conclude that less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the Conservation Area. There is little to no public benefit derived from the proposal, the public benefits would therefore not outweigh the harm. On this basis, it would not accord with the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
11. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the BTM and by extension, the character and appearance, and significance of the Conservation Area. Public benefits have not been demonstrated that would outweigh the harm. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP1, LP3, and LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, adopted July 2018, that seek to ensure that development proposals relate to their context and preserve and enhance conservation areas and BTMs.

Other Matters

12. Even if the proposed development complies with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan, insofar that it did not harm the living conditions of future occupiers or neighbouring residents, and the proposal allows for a sufficient amount of internal space these would be neutral factors.

² Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations, May 2015, London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
14. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR